



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Rachel tribes, Yahweh comes from Sinai to help his people. Elijah also, the prophet of the Northern Kingdom, seeks Yahweh at Horeb (=Sinai) (I Kings 19:8). In the traditions of the stay at Kadesh we find the Leah tribes specially mentioned, e.g., Reuben and Levi (Num. 16:1; Deut. 33:8), but never Joseph. Joshua, the leader of Ephraim, although inserted by P, is conspicuous by his absence from the story of the sending of the spies from Kadesh in J, E, and D.

We conclude, accordingly, that the archaeological evidence in Egypt and the Hebrew traditions of the sojourn in

Egypt and the exodus favor the view that part of the tribes of Israel settled in Canaan as early as the Eighteenth Dynasty, and that these tribes did not go down to Egypt. Other tribes that did not enter Canaan with the first migration went down to Egypt, were enslaved there by Ramses II of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and did not escape and enter Canaan until the latter part of the Nineteenth or the Twentieth Dynasty. In the next article it will be shown that this conclusion is supported by the Old Testament narratives of the conquest of Canaan.

THE OLD AND THE NEW DENOMINATIONALISM

JOHN EDWARDS LE BOSQUET

Boulder, Colorado

The churches of the United States have been praised and blamed by turns. They have been defended and attacked. The very existence of their Christianity has been denied¹ on the one hand, and, on the other hand, and worst of all, they have been calmly ignored by millions year after year. They have never, however, been carefully and coolly studied for what they really are—with especial regard, as should always be the case with a contemporary phenomenon, to deeper-lying and as yet unnoted facts and forces. A sociology of the present-day church has yet to be written, profoundly though it is needed. Such a

book—or series of books, as it would turn out to be, no doubt—would stop in an instant many, if not most, of the sweeping swashbuckling generalities which are now to be heard both pro and con; still better, it would be likely to suggest several practical objectives as yet unthought of, and to promote greater efficiency in moving toward them.

While we are waiting for such a painstaking scientific survey—which is likely to linger long in the present preoccupation of sociologists with historical studies—it can do no harm to have a few impressions recorded, in a scientific, sociological interest, even if not based

¹ In George K. Turner's *The Last Christian*.

upon statistics or questionnaires, but only upon personal experience. These can be the more valuable, because the adoption of points of view is one of the most difficult preliminaries to a study of contemporary life. The fact is that that which is living and more or less effective close by us is most exceedingly difficult to have even an opinion about—an opinion, that is, which is an insight and not a prejudice. Everybody has seen and smiled at the statuette of a stout gentleman whistling furiously at his little dog and wondering irritably where on earth he is, while all the time that same dog is sitting up eagerly and patiently at his master's feet, concealed from him by his—the master's—Falstaffian proportions. It is not that perplexed dog only, but many far more important realities which are near by and yet unseen: unseen because near by! The true inwardness of facts and institutions in which we are now living will be far easier to perceive after twenty years, say, than today. The sociologist takes the simpler task in choosing the far-away rather than the near-at-hand for investigation. It was not strange, but quite what one might expect, that a former Tammany mayor should specialize—upon twentieth-century New York? No, not at all; but upon mediaeval Venice!

It is to one aspect of church life at present, its denominationalism, that this article wishes to confine itself, asking, not what is wrong or right, but what are the facts, the real underlying facts.

The ordinary reaction of the average person upon the subject is that denominations are wasteful and unnecessary and reprehensible. We are going to out-

grow them some day. Utopia is being worked toward in the various church-unity projects, but all that is far off in the hazy future; meanwhile the divisions of the church constitute the very best of excuses for having nothing to do with any church of any denomination. As a matter of fact, however, nothing is more certain, if one will deeply ponder the situation, than this, that the old denominations not only ought to disappear and some time will be done away with, but that they are disappearing already; in many ways one can and even must speak of a decay of denominationalism, so far as the older connotation of denominationalism goes. There still exist the Baptists and Methodists and the Presbyterians and all the other array, but to the sociological eye they are survivals, galvanically stimulated to a semblance of life now and then but not self-moving and alive. Seldom will the church be found where a glowing insistent denominational feeling demands its expression in machinery and *drives* that machinery. In so far as denominationalism exists at all, it is worked *for* by imposing machinery—surely a conspicuous putting of the cart before the horse. What is this but to say that the present-day denominations as denominations are superficial externalisms, not deep-rooted, vital affairs? As externalisms they are labored upon with the same zeal with which legalists and formalists, from the “false prophets” of Jeremiah's time and the Pharisees of Jesus' day to the scholastics of the Middle Age, have toiled and sweated to preserve the *status quo*. There are some, for example, of the “men at headquarters”—the secretaries, the bishops,

the superintendents—whose horizons are absolutely shut in by the bounds of their particular sect, who are committed heart and soul to denominationalism, and who work with an enthusiasm worthy of a better cause, striving strenuously, if diplomatically and irenically, to keep the denominational ship afloat and as near as possible to the head of the line. It is not to be denied, either, that there are in every local church a few like-minded laymen who shout and, what is more to the purpose, work with a will for their particular brand of “ism,” eagerly competing against other local churches without, and sedulously cultivating what they call “the denominational consciousness” within. These, led and stiffened ordinarily by their pastor—who is *ex officio* a denominationalist or supposed to be—and encouraged by frequent visits from one or another of the dignitaries aforesaid, labor in every possible way for the denomination “über alles, über alles auf der Welt.” But the existence of such sincere and very effective denominationalists does not therefore mean that the denominations are not decaying. Quite the contrary, the frantic efforts of these and their shrill appeals are rather evidence that they are conscious, or more accurately, subconscious, that their denomination is slipping away.

The chief reason for asserting the decay of the old denominationalism is the surprising lack of difference between the different churches. Church government is most obviously various, yet the denominations have made great strides in the way of changes and always—excepting the Roman Catholics—in the direction of greater similarity to one

another. The churches governed chiefly from above, as the Methodists and Presbyterians and Episcopalians, have become far more democratic, or at least far more compliant with popular desires, than they ever used to be, while the churches making much of local independence have been of late adding a surprising amount of oversight from above “in the interests of efficiency” through the setting up of secretaries, state (largely) and national—“dehorned bishops,” as they are jestingly and not entirely inaccurately entitled. So liturgically, Episcopalians are to be heard—outside their church edifices at least—extemporizing prayers, while the dissenting churches are using written prayers now and then in their opening service, and one denomination at least—the Presbyterian—has its Book of Common Prayer. The celebration of holy days is coming back. Lenten talks and services are not limited to Episcopal churches. In general there is a richer liturgical service in those very sects which used to abhor such ornamentations as all but diabolic. Doctrinally there is the most uniformity of all. The foundation stone of denominations earlier was the theology of each. Wesleyan Arminianism and Presbyterian Calvinism and Episcopal Sacramentarianism and Baptist Immersionism—these were articles of faith which were not only essential but were always in evidence. Today, however, though these are assented to, it is with but slight interest; and so far as the preaching of them is concerned, it is, in the more influential churches, very nearly non-existent. If one well versed in theological subtleties were set down, eyes shut, in the average

Protestant dissenting church of a Sunday morning, it would be, I venture to say, practically impossible, save in the rarest cases, for the auditor to distinguish from the service and the doctrines of the sermon with what denomination he was that morning worshipping. Particular preachers differ widely from one another, and the services and sermons of churches do decidedly diverge according to these differences between their pastors, but such variations are personal and not at all denominational. That this is true is indicated in the well-known fact that ministers are being called almost every week from the pulpit of one denomination to the pulpit of another, and begin at once, ordinarily with no period of novitiate, to preach in the new denomination as acceptably as they ever did in the earlier one.

But the similarity of denominations is more than an academic thesis. It is a pragmatic truth. That is to say, for the average man's actual behavior, denominational names are distinctions without the least difference. In earlier times a Methodist could never be content in a Presbyterian congregation nor a Presbyterian in a Methodist one, but nowadays a Methodist from Nebraska is in Colorado frequently found to have put his letter in with the Presbyterians or even the Congregationalists, and vice versa. More significant is the fact that a considerable number of people—add them all together—will worship for a longer or shorter time, now with one local church, now with another. One meets—in the West at least—with the curious phenomenon of a family whose children will go to the Methodist Sunday school, say, and to the Presby-

terian young people's society. There are women who go to one church's woman's society and to another church's preaching services. The cases are not few of members of the same family divided between two or three churches. Migration from denomination to denomination is not lessening but rather becoming more and more a fact to be practically reckoned with by the individual churches, and it signifies that even though denominations should not be decaying, denominational fences certainly are, which amounts to the same thing.

One who feels—as the writer does—that denominationalism of the old type had better go than stay can scarcely regret phenomena of the sort just mentioned. They are an indication of church unity which is encouraging indeed, being not at all the "church unity" which is usually meant by the phrase—an affair of Hague conferences, so to speak, of the higher diplomatic representatives of the various denominations—but a unity of spirit, an unofficial, widespread, democratic failure to react to shibboleths of separation. It is not, to be sure, unity itself, but rather a negative preliminary to it, yet to perceive but the first steps to unity is encouraging, when these give promise of being irresistible. The very pervasiveness of the bromide that "one church is as good as another" indicates much to the thoughtful observer as to the decay of denominationalism.

It should be mentioned, however, in passing that, paradoxically enough, the first effect of this popular indifference to denominations is decidedly to increase and even embitter denominational

rivalry. The very fact that average persons in any particular community will go to any church heightens the earnestness of the small coterie in each church of the denominationally minded to draw this public into their denomination as against any and every other. And if the great mass of possible church attendants are unaffected by appeals to denominationalism, then what is left for the denominationalists but to play up as strongly as may be every other possible drawing feature: as many and interesting organizations as possible, teas and even dinners for newcomers, contests between "reds" and "blues"—to determine which can secure the most additions to this or that society or church service—open forums, stereopticon lectures, lurid sermon topics, a high-priced choir or a rousing chorus or an orchestra, and so on, to provide entertainment, culminating in moving pictures or the so-called Sunday evening "Sacred Concert" *sans* sermon, sometimes *sans* prayer, *sans* Scripture, *sans* everything but pure competition! Thus rabid denominationalism among a few pace-setters, in the present state of denominational laxity, delivers the churches or some of them over to what is on the one hand preoccupation with non-religious matters, and on the other hand to some one of the many forms of sensationalism and "holy vaudeville." I am far from saying that all these methods are improper; some of them are useful in opening ways of approach to the unchurched. But to use them only as "attractions" by which one church may outvie the rest, and draw away from them people who would go to some church anyhow; and even often

to use these extraneous endeavors to reach in and "proselyte" those already attending and members of another denominational organization—all this is, to say nothing else, wasteful in the extreme; and prostitutes religion to denominationalism in its meanest and most anti-religious form.

But whatever be one's personal attitude toward such denominational activities, they do certainly go to show that denominationalism as such is what the politicians would call "a dead issue," so far as the public without, and even largely within, the churches is concerned. Because people will go, other things being equal, to one church as readily as to another, because denominational emphases find deaf ears, therefore this frantic eagerness in some quarters to work through those "other things" and see to it that they are not "equal" but unequal in favor of our particular sect.

All this is not to say that a decade hence, or possibly in a half-century even, there will be no Baptists or Unitarians or what not. The present denominational bodies are strongly manned and resolutely toiled for; their machinery is efficient and new methods are used with a skill which would elicit the admiration of social experts if they paid any attention to the church of the present. Existing denominations have an excellent outlook for remaining for centuries and even—if the Roman Catholic survival has anything to suggest, as I think it has—for millenniums to come. The thing which is here is, it should be noted, not the decay of the old denominations, but the decay of the old denominationalism, and it is precisely the latter and not the former which is

significant. It takes a vital and a widely present consciousness of church differences to keep denominationalism a real social force; but there are many other facts and inertias which must be taken into account in considering the prospect for existence of a "going concern," such as—with some exceptions—every present denomination indubitably is.

To be accurate, it should be added that what has been asserted with regard to denominational indifference within the churches cannot be said to hold true of a few sects, usually small and little influential, nationally speaking, as the Adventists and the "Seventh-Day" bodies and the Mormons, and notably that far from obscure folk, the Christian Scientists. That these are clearly exceptions is to be grasped in the fact that their propaganda seldom uses extraneous inducements and is wholly, even finely, denominational in the true sense of the word.

We are now ready, having heard so much of the decay of denominationalism, to modulate from that minor into a major key. It is high time, that is, to pause upon a few suggestions as to another and more really existent denominationalism which is just coming into being. Surely if a Gibbon could in a treatise upon *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* discuss, as he chiefly does, the rise of the Middle Age politics and civilization, then one

might appropriately join to the consideration of the decay of the old denominationalism—an essential but as yet hidden decay—some remarks at least upon a new denominational alignment, also essential and hidden, as being a motive-power of action but with no social-organic expression and scarcely even a name.

Hoping that the reader's curiosity is awakened, I hasten to add that this new denominational cleavage lies in the distinction between conservative and liberal, a distinction which is in many respects a fundamental human one, and is just at present cropping out in fact if not in externals in many present-day churches. It is not necessary, even were there space here, to define these two with any care. Suffice it to say that the conservative in religious matters, like the stand-patter in general, has his eyes somewhat more turned to the past than to the present; he believes in authority, which means in his mouth the authority of the traditional phrases, the traditional ideas, and the scholarship in general of the past. The liberal, on the contrary, feels profoundly the importance of the present, which means confidence in personal insights and the necessity of growth—including change where necessary—and the validity of contemporary scholarship.¹ This classification of the religious traverses the other and current classification which is stratified in the existing denominations. Every sect or very

¹ It is the less necessary to go into details, because what these differences are is being very much pondered nowadays. For example, it is the discussion of this very point which occupies the following which occur to me wholly at random: A. Sabatier, *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit* (trans. 1904); G. B. Smith, *Social Idealism and the Changing Theology* (1914); W. A. Brown, "The Old Theology and the New," *Harvard Theological Review*, January, 1911; H. A. Youtz, *The Enlarging Conception of God* (1914).

nearly every one has its liberals and its conservatives. Majorities vary, to be sure. The Presbyterian conservatives appear to be in command of the situation in their group—nationally regarded, at all events. The Methodists are more or less fighting the thing out. The Episcopalians have, it would seem, a conservative upper house and a liberal lower house. Among the Congregationalists the liberals are by far the more numerous and influential; and the same is coming true of the Baptists, excepting in the tinier communities. Even among the Roman Catholics there are not only the old school, to which the late Pope Pius IX belonged and which he was determined should be the only party in the church, but there were and, despite the fact that they are silenced, there are the modernists, who are sure that they are as good Catholics as any of the so-called orthodox.¹ And not only numerical distribution varies, but conservatism and liberalism are somewhat different in their content, according to the denomination which is their habitat. The Unitarian conservative—an Andrew P. Peabody, for example—is not in the least the impossible person which the “blue Presbyterian” or the “hard-shell Baptist” for most of us is. The Episcopal liberal roars as gently as a sucking dove as compared with certain Congregational fire-eaters. Yet despite all variations the liberals are as a whole like-minded, as also no less are the conservatives. The difference between a conservative Methodist, say, and a liberal Methodist is much greater than that obtaining between a Methodist liberal and a Presbyterian liberal. There is

in this conservative-liberal classification a vital and significant “denominationalism” such as none of the so-called denominations—save in the exceptions noted—come anywhere near even approaching. Here is a sect-forming motif and spirit, but as yet with no outward expression in any well-defined generally realized social organism—the exact antithesis, be it noted, to the older denominationalism which has the social organisms and popular recognition but is decaying and all but dead in energetic denominational feeling. Yet there are certain crystallizings into social institutions of the newer “denominational” consciousness, tentative and unregarded though they are. The annual gathering of revivalists amounts to a social expression of the conservative religious attitude; and the same might be said of that society which has been launched within the past decade for the purpose of coming to the “defense” of the “old Bible” against the attacks and innuendoes of those villains, the higher critics. There are weeklies and reviews too; and there are “sound” theological seminaries which draw beyond the bounds of their own sect. For the liberals there is no organization probably, but practically every college and university in the country is of this religious party; and there are reviews which give self-consciousness to liberal ideas; among these there should especially be commended the frank and clear attempt to educate the laity of “the awakening church” which the *Biblical World* is making.

So far as the church, in its existing denominations, is concerned, it must be

¹ Cf. G. Tyrrell, “Mediaevalism and Modernism,” *Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1908.

admitted that the conservatives do on the whole preponderatingly hold the field. The average church one enters is far more likely to be conservative than liberal, and this is overwhelmingly borne in upon one, if one knows well the many communities of 10,000 and under. The city is more favorable to liberalism, but the balance remains the same even there. Parts of the country differ; speaking generally, the farther east the more liberal, the farther west and south the more conservative. The church at large, as church, is conservative. The liberals are there but are outnumbered and overawed to a large and deplorable extent. When one looks outside the church the color of things is entirely different. There are conservatives there—one stumbles upon them sometimes, men and women who never have had anything to do with any church, whose religious ideas are cast entirely, for all that, in the phrases they used to hear as boys and girls. But the great mass of non-churchgoers is liberal. The liberal within the church is often reproached for this fact indeed, for what reason it would be hard to say, for on the one hand churchgoing is not, after all, the greatest of the virtues, and on the other hand much of the religious life outside the church is deep and hearty and valuable, though vague and frequently lacking in insight.¹ It would seem that the chief reason why liberal-thinking religious men and women stay outside the church is that they are repelled by the predominance of the conservative in the church. They get the impression, which is all the more

firm because they probably never stop to think of it at all, that conservative ideas upon religious matters and membership in the church are simply synonymous. They do not realize, what we liberals in the church do, that there is a fighting chance for liberal ideas; nay, that the church is yearly growing and developing strength by its increasing sense of the value of scholarship, and by its application to every part of the religious life and thought of those well-recognized maxims and conceptions which the scientific world regards as matter of course. The churches, especially the liberals among them, need to make connection with and be reinforced by the earnest religion which is in the world—especially in the thinking world—and speaks very nearly (not quite, but nearly) the same language, and in any case holds precisely the same ideas on religious matters, as the devout Christian who is of the liberal wing. Just what should be done is hard to say. The Unitarians have tried sometimes to capitalize liberal religious-mindedness to their own denominational advantage, claiming explicitly, or more often implicitly, that their sect and theirs only was really liberal! But it cannot be said that they have had much success in this procedure when they have employed it. They have had even less success in pompous invitations to “the oppressed” among the Baptists, Presbyterians, etc., to come to them and be at liberty. The Unitarians as a social organism seem to have been not very attractive to the liberals elsewhere. Why is it? Is it due to a Unitarian lack of sympathy

¹ See the author's article on “The Modern Man's Religion,” *Harvard Theological Review*, January, 1914.

with the great common people, or is it because Unitarians are too negatively oriented, saying far more what they do not believe than proclaiming warmly what they *do* believe?² Who can say? At all events the liberal movement, this half of the "new denominationalism" as it must from a sociological standpoint be termed, is larger than any one denomination—in the older meaning of the word. It is larger even than the church itself. May the liberals within all the churches be able sooner or later to accomplish what the Unitarians—for whatever reason—were not equal to! May they make plain to those outside, who agree with them though they (the outsiders) do not yet know it, the vital truth that religion must be socialized and that the church is the place where such a socializing can best be brought to pass. Religion, let them declare as plainly as they can, is but a pale sentimentality in the person who is religious, if he does not feel and worship shoulder to shoulder with his neighbors in the brotherhood of man; and religion, let them insist even more strenuously, effects nothing mighty and lasting in society unless it comes into and upon

society as the bulky immensity and the hoarse unmistakable shout of a multitude of individuals become an irresistible social organism striding on conquering and to conquer for God and men's right!

It is a twin "denominationalism" then which is alone existent and insistent in the religious life of our age. The conservative and the liberal are neither of them the whole story; very likely indeed neither could long persist wholly apart from the other's criticism and unconsciously given and received spiritual life; for as it has been with the Roman Catholic and the Protestant—enemies, yet each perhaps the most beneficial factor of the other's life—so perhaps in a larger and more lasting fashion there may be an eternal mutual influence going on here so that this twin denominationalism is at bottom, not a duality, but a unity—real church unity at last in sight. There is some meaning and even a thrilling social hopefulness, in the widely current rejection of denominationalism; only let none be negative only. "Denominationalism, the old denominationalism, is dead! Long live the new denominationalism!"

² For a fuller discussion of this point, see E. S. Ames, *The Divinity of Christ*, 1911, chap. iii, ("Why I Am not a Unitarian").